

[]

**SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT
LAND PLANNING AGENCY/PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

SUBJECT: Myrtle Street Special Area Study – Phase III Conservation Village Concept Implementation Presentation

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development **DIVISION:** Planning

AUTHORIZED BY: Matthew West **CONTACT:** Tony Walter **EXT.** 7375

Agenda Date 11/05/03 **Regular** ☐ **Consent** ☐ **Work Session** ☐ **Briefing** ☐
Public Hearing – 1:30 ☐ **Public Hearing – 7:00** ☒

MOTION/RECOMMENDATION:

1. RECOMMEND accepting the study and implementation of the concept with staff and consultant criteria and comments.
2. RECOMMEND accepting the study and implementation of the concept with alternate criteria and comments.
3. RECOMMEND accepting the study with no further actions
4. CONTINUE this item to a date and time certain.

(District 5 – Commissioner McLain)

(Tony Matthews, Planner)

BACKGROUND:

The Board of County Commissioners directed staff to conduct Phase III of the Myrtle Street Special Area Study to conduct further financial analysis and develop an implementation strategy for the Conservation Village Concept to provide for an opportunity to apply for density bonuses to encourage development with significant public benefit as they relate to roads, water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure, preservation of upland open areas, and quality of life in Seminole County.

Staff has conducted a series of focus group meetings to collect input from the neighborhood, the development community and County departments and other regulatory agencies that would be impacted by the implementation of the Conservation Village Concept. Staff and the consultant have taken this input and developed a series of proposed criteria for consideration in granting density bonuses. Staff will make a brief presentation of the study results and proposed criteria at the meeting.

Reviewed by:
Co Atty: [Signature]
DFS: _____
Other: _____
DCM: _____
CM: _____
File No. Z2003-024

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

RECOMMEND accepting the study and implementation of the concept with staff and consultant criteria and comments.

Attachment: Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment

OVERVIEW OF PHASE III

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this study is to identify and prepare needed amendments to Seminole County's Vision 2020 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to incorporate policies supportive of the Conservation Village development and design concepts developed in Phase II. Phase III will also involve preparation of new or amended ordinance provisions in the Seminole County Land Development Code and evaluation of possible incentive approaches.

TASKS:

- Identify and assist with drafting new or amended Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan Policy Amendments and Land Development Code revisions.
- Identify and evaluate regulatory incentives.
- Conduct stakeholder and public involvement process.
- Cost analysis.

STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:

The public and stakeholder involvement process is the heart of this effort. It is designed to continue involvement of residents and property owners within the study area and to inform and seek input from the development community and regulatory agencies. The Community Task Force that was established in Phase II of the study serves as the control group that reviews and comments on all aspects of the study. The focus groups, their purpose, members and input are reviewed below:

Member Description	Purpose	Input
"Development Community" – a small group of individuals involved in local land development activities, including developers, professional services (engineers, land planners, attorneys), real estate, etc.	The purpose of this session was to obtain feedback on conservation design approaches and potential implementing policies or regulations, potential opportunities and constraints to such development in the area, potential infrastructure cost savings, and the potential effectiveness of incentives to encourage such practices.	Solid concept with significant potential and benefit. Issues of concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open space maintenance• Density & clustering reducing costs?• Incentives needed to entice and improve feasibility• Swales/ditches developed in segments may be inconsistent with a larger system Myrtle Street related comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Groundwater level

		<p>impacts cost of infrastructure and streets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 2.5 to 3.0 DU/AC needed in area to be feasible with improvements <p>Enjoyed and appreciated opportunity for input</p>
<p>“Interagency Focus Group” a small group of individuals representing Seminole County departments and other area agencies with potential interest in conservation-oriented development (St John’s River Water Management District, state/federal environmental resource agencies) etc.</p>	<p>The purpose of this session was to obtain feedback on conservation design approaches and potential opportunities and constraints to such development in the area, in terms of particular agency programs, requirements or concerns and potential infrastructure cost savings.</p>	<p>Drainage should focus on volume, diversion and water quality. Countywide vs. Myrtle Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desirable as a “test balloon” for the rest of the county • Increased size of developable area improves chances of success <p>Primary and Secondary Conservation standards should follow current requirements. Determination of density should follow current format. Development of conservation villages by right (instead of PUD) sounds more effective. Maintenance endowment a MUST to maintain conservation areas.</p>
<p>“Community Task Force” property owners and residents as well as interested attendees from the Phase II study effort.</p>	<p>The purpose of these sessions was to obtain feedback on all aspects of the study.</p>	<p>Participants from the Task Force and staff will present their response at the meeting.</p>
<p>“Land Planning Agency/ Planning & Zoning Commission”</p>	<p>Prior to the BCC public hearing staff will brief the LPA/ P&Z members on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment(s) and other recommendations resulting</p>	

PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT:

The consultant concurs with the recommended text changes to the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan transmitted to the Department of Community Affairs August 12, 2003 with one exception. They suggest that the reference “in the Myrtle Street Special Study area” be removed to facilitate implementation of the concept in Suburban Estate Land Use areas throughout the County.

Staff recommends that the reference to the Myrtle Street Special Study Area remain as directed by the Board of County Commissioners when they authorized Phase III of the study.

PROPOSED ZONING REVISIONS:

The consultant recommends a stand alone zoning category for development by right as opposed to the Planned Unit Development Process. Their recommendation contains the following criteria:

- Density and Dimensions
 - Density format and cluster “reward”
 - Dimensions of minimum lot sizes, set backs, etc. follow familiar numbers
- Greenway Ownership & Maintenance Plan (*Greenway is the reserved open/conservation area*)
 - Required Greenway Maintenance Plan
 - 3 forms of ownership
 - Fee simple dedication
 - Homeowner’s Association
 - Private conservation organization
- Density Bonuses (*Current density is at 1.0 DU/AC. Cumulative with bonuses up to 2.5 DU/AC*)
 - Maintenance Endowment (0.3 DU/AC)
 - Water/ Sewer Connection (0.4 DU/AC)
 - Stormwater Volume Reduction (0.6 DU/AC)
 - Water Quality Treatment (0.2 DU/AC)
- Approval Process
 - Development Plan
 - Preliminary Plan
 - Final Plan

Staff recommends implementation of the Conservation Village Concept with a cumulative density cap of 2.0 DU/AC.

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Affordable housing
- Public access to Greenways
- Large/Combined parcel development
- Potential Greenway Map

- Expansion to other Districts
- Narrow streets & sidewalk flexibility
- Mixed Use/TND Integration
- Diversion from Six Mile Creek
- Streamlined Approval Process

Staff and the consultant will present an example using the consultant's recommendations at the meeting which will illustrate the cost impacts of the concept.

CONSERVATION VILLAGE TEXT AMENDMENTS

OBJECTIVE FLU SPECIFIC AREA PLANS

Amendment 03F.TXT03.1 New Policy

Policy FLU 9.3 Myrtle Street Study Area Conservation Village Development Concept

The County shall provide for creative design concepts focused on preservation of natural open spaces, sensitive lands and area character within planned unit developments in the Myrtle Street Special Study area to:

- A Maximize preservation of conservation areas and unique features of the site;
- B Encourage creative design by clustering homes into “villages” surrounded by natural open spaces;
- C Incorporate trail and pedestrian opportunities;
- D Promote enhanced street systems resulting in reduced infrastructure and impervious surfaces;
- E Provide for storm water conveyance and retention that exceeds on-site requirements; and
- F Provide for an opportunity to apply for density bonuses to encourage developments with significant public benefit as they relate to roads, water, sewer and storm water infrastructure, preservation of upland open areas, and quality of life in Seminole County.

Amendment 03F.TXT03.2 Addition to Issues and Concerns

Issue FLU 7 Special Area Plans and Evaluation and Appraisal Report Amendments

Since Plan adoption in 1991, several areas of the County have been identified as requiring more effective growth management techniques and community consensus building to ensure consistency with the goals and objectives of the Future Land Use Element. To address these concerns, several special area studies have been completed. Included among these is the “GreeneWay/SR 434 Small Area Study” (1994), “Airport Area Land Use Study” (1995), Northwest HIP Study (1995 and associated North I-4 Target Area Master Plan in 1996), “Chuluota Small Area Study” (1999), “Wekiva Special Area Study” (1999), and “Myrtle Street Special Area Study (2003)”.

These studies have resulted in future land use amendments and/or policy amendments to the Plan to manage growth and development more effectively.

Additionally, in 1999, upon evaluation of the *Exhibit FLU: Future Land Use Map*, the County adopted a number of administrative future land use amendments on properties throughout the County where it was determined that the existing future land use designation was no longer appropriate. These future land use amendments and amendments resulting from the Chuluota Small Area Study and Wekiva Special Area Study were identified in the County's 1999 Evaluation and Appraisal Report found sufficient by the Florida Department of Community Affairs.